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# Substantive Answers

1. Perm: do both – require employers to pay a living wage AND give people a UBI. Recasts jobs as merely supplemental income

**A.** worker respect – even if you don’t need to be in the labor market, participating shouldn’t open you up to mistreatment

**B.** UBI can never be calibrated perfectly – people supporting large families will need more. Perm ensures their jobs pay enough to be helpful for those who need them. Also means you don’t solve desperation – only helps the small nuclear family, which entrenches assumptions about it.

**C.** CP without a living wage puts downward pressure on wages since employers use it as a justification to cut them, combination is key

2. Perm: do the aff and CP for unemployed people. Means no one worries about losing their job. Also means the UBI can be higher since people wouldn’t all need it at once

3. CP is functionally regressive: it dismantles programs that target and give all their money to the poor for programs that give some to the wealthiest too: there’s less money for people who need it most

4. Targeting is key – you can’t just give everyone the money to put their kids through college while supporting a child with special educational needs. The only way to meet that is with specialized programs that the CP gets rid of.

5. **Immigration Tradeoff** – A UBI basically requires shutting down immigration. **McArdle ‘14[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The greatest poverty reduction program that the world has ever seen has been the United States of America. We have, for decades, over a century, been moving people who are extremely poor in the countries where they are, to a country where, just by being here, their wages can double or triple or quadruple. That would not in any way be compatible with a guaranteed minimum income, just politically. If you come here and become a citizen, that entitles you to a check for $15,000 a year for the rest of your life from the U.S. government? A lot of immigrants are low-wage workers. They’re not skilled, a lot of them. They don’t have as much education as most Americans and so they never do get up to the point where they would ever pay enough in taxes to make back that check. Even if you just limited it to their children, the political support for importing people whose children will then be entitled to the same $15,000 a year as your children — I don’t think that would ever be politically viable. So if you want to have a guaranteed minimum income, you need to shut down, pretty much effectively, shut down immigration, or at least immigration from lower skilled countries, which on net would do a lot more to increase global poverty than it would to decrease poverty in the United States.

It would also encourage people to make it much harder to become a citizen and exacerbate xenophobic paranoia about immigrants stealing citizens. **Outweighs**:

**A.** Card is explicitly comparative, the global poverty impacts outweigh the domestic benefit

**B.** Scope: It would move people ideologically to the right on immigration which means much worse policies passed overall, the impact spills over and leads to broader attacks on immigrants

***[If Citizens-Only]*** *Makes it worse for immigrants – citizens have income supports so they drive down wages since they need less from employers. Means that immigrants have to work for way-below subsistence wages. Perm ensures that everyone can meet their needs.*

6. Having to pay the higher wages is a crucial basis for worker respect since the payment is implicitly a value judgment – otherwise workers will be treated really poorly. **Rogers ‘14[[2]](#footnote-2)**

Ultimately, transfers that are not accompanied by wage regulations can substantially undermine social equality even as they create employment opportunities. For example, consider the effects on low-wage labor markets if the minimum wage were repealed altogether and replaced with the EITC or a general wage subsidy. At a certain market wage—say, $2 an hour— even middle-class families would have lives of luxury. Food would be cheap. Few such families would mow their own lawn or clean their own house anymore. Many could even hire a butler, or a chef, or perhaps a chauffeur to make long commutes more tolerable. Notably, those workers might even have a decent standard of living if the EITC or wage subsidy were high enough. But history strongly suggests that many would treat all those $2-an-hour servants poorly, reasoning that their low wages must be due to some moral failing and consum ers’ lives of leisure due to some moral virtue

## Extra Offense Cards

### Inequality (Comparative)

Can’t solve inequality. comparative evidence. **Waltman ‘02[[3]](#footnote-3)**

When it come to softening inequality, the living wage wins again. Because everyone gets the same UBI, there is no compressing of income skews. In fact, a UBI could actually increase inequality. Affluent people would have more money to invest, and the long term impacts of accumulation versus spending would exacerbate the wealth gap. A living wage, as I define it, would at least keep everyone in sight of the mean.

### Worker Organizing

Plan is key to give workers the power to fight for future gains. It enables them to resist domination in other aspects of their work. **Rogers[[4]](#footnote-4)**

2. Formal Legal Entitlements and Self-Respect.—Minimum wage laws also enhance workers’ self-respect by granting them formal legal entitlements vis-à-vis employers. This is in part an expressive effect of minimum wage laws, which are an easily grasped policy “that symbolizes the political system’s commitment to working people.”165 Such laws signal that the state and broader society view workers as worthy of legal protection, even when doing so imposes costs upon more powerful social groups, as captured well in the textile worker quote in this Article’s introduction. But the legal entitlements provided by minimum wage laws are not merely symbolic. Under such laws, workers can hale employers into court to prevent enforcement of labor contracts that pay less than the minimum, employers owe workers correlative duties, and state agencies stand ready to intervene on behalf of workers. The relationship between formal rights and self-respect is an enormous topic, but a few notes on that relationship within political and social theory should suffice to develop this point. Within liberalism, this idea seems to have animated Rawls’s argument that in a just society “self-respect is secured by the public affirmation of the status of equal citizenship for all” through protection of equal liberties,166 as well as through the fact that “everyone endorses the difference principle, itself a form of reciprocity.”167 Public affirmation of such rights helps demonstrate that rights-bearing individuals are moral equals of other citizens. Once that moral equality is clear, employers will not as readily subject such workers to abuses, and workers will more readily contest unfair treatment by employers and other private actors.

Outweighs on scope – you can solve the present instance of harm, but this enables employees enables them to fight future employer mistreatment. I create a structural force for future change.**.**

## Solvency Defense – Can’t Be Enough

A UBI that actually met workers basic needs is impossible; the only practical UBI isn’t enough to replace a job, which means you’re still dependent on money from your job and disads to the squo apply. **Tanner ‘14[[5]](#footnote-5)**

For example, if every American were to receive a flat cash grant that was large enough so as to enable the poor to support themselves in the absence of other welfare programs, the cost would likely be prohibitive. Zwolinski does not propose any specific income, but cites Charles Murray’s suggestion of $10,000 per person. Spread over a U.S. citizen population of roughly 296 million, the cost of such a program would be $2.96 trillion, or almost 3 times our current welfare expenditure. And there is considerable question as to whether $10,000 would be a sufficient grant. Last year, the poverty threshold for a single individual under 65, after all, was $12,119. Of course, some suggest using the basic income to replace middle-class social welfare programs such as Social Security and Medicare, as well as those targeted to the poor. The idea of abolishing Social Security and Medicare is far more problematic, both politically and practically, than using UBI to replace more conventional welfare programs. Besides, it still wouldn’t raise enough money to fund a truly universal basic income. Using CBO data for 2013, eliminating welfare state programs including Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, income security and so forth (but excluding tax expenditures) would yield only $2.13 trillion. If we also included, as some have suggested, so-called tax expenditures, such as the mortgage interest deduction and the exclusion of employer contributions, as well as Social Security, EITC and CTC related tax expenditures, we could add an additional $393 billion for a total of $2.5 trillion. That still wouldn’t be enough.

### [Framewok-Dependent] Reciprocal Obligations

It’s important that employers pay it – they receive benefits from employees that means they should compensate them. **Rogers[[6]](#footnote-6)**

The fact that employment is a bilateral and reciprocal relationship justifies the institutional form of minimum wage laws, i.e., the requirement that employers themselves pay higher wages. The harsh conditions and status harms of low-wage employment do not occur in a vacuum: employers and managers enjoy individualized and institutional benefits from workers’ efforts, benefits that are not always shared with the rest of society. Those include profits as well as the higher social esteem and occupational autonomy that accompany entrepreneurship and management. Given such agent-specific benefits, and given that such benefits occur within social structures that impose reciprocal harms on employees, it seems entirely appropriate for employers to shoulder the bulk of the redistributive burdens imposed by minimum wage laws, rather than mediating all redistribution through the state.

# Theory

## UBI Spec

**Interpretation**: if the neg reads a counterplan that guarantees a certain income level to every citizen independent of working, they must specify and have a solvency advocate who defends both a funding source and a benefit level – either an amount in some unit of currency or as method of calculation.

They violate – have neither.

Prefer: 1. **Predictability** – you can identify any combination of amount and source, a solvency advocate is key to test if this is really remotely plausible – specifically key with UBI proposals since they’re such a radical departure from the squo. That means for UBI counterplans, the burden needs to be on them. A solvency advocate is also key for me to predict the CP and figure out how it interacts with the aff. Also no cards I could read saying it’s not possible since they haven’t been written without an initial advocate to disagree with. Predictability is key to fairness, knowledge of arguments before enables us to do prep to win in-round.

2. **Ground** – sure they’re all basic income policies, but how much and how it’s funded materially affect it’s ability to solve the plan, and tradeoff disads related to cutting what it funds are key CP ground that’s only accessible if you tell me what it is. Ground is key to fairness because it’s key to making arguments to win the round. That ground is key – it’s the core objections in the literature. **Van Parijs [[7]](#footnote-7)** summarizes objections:

Suppose everything I have said thus far is persuasive: that the UBI, if it could be instituted, would be a natural and attractive way of ensuring a fair distribution of real freedom, fighting unemployment without increasing poverty, and promoting the central goals of both the feminist and the green movements. What are the objections? Perhaps the most common is that a UBI would cost too much. Such a statement is of course meaningless if the amount and the scale is left unspecified. At a level of $150 per month and per person, a UBI is obviously affordable in some places, since this is the monthly equivalent of what every Alaskan receives as an annual dividend. Could one afford a UBI closer to the poverty line? By simply multiplying the poverty threshold for a one-person household by the population of a country, one soon reaches scary amounts–often well in excess of the current level of total government expenditure. But these calculations are misleading. A wide range of existing benefits can be abolished or reduced once a UBI is in place. And for most people of working age, the basic income and the increased taxes (most likely in the form of an abolition of exemptions and of low tax rates for the lowest income brackets) required to pay for it will largely offset each other. In a country such as the United States, which has developed a reasonably effective revenue collection system, what matters is not the gross cost but its distributive impact–which could easily work out the same for a UBI or an NIT.

Prefer this– he’s THE main proponent of the UBI, so his discription of the objections to it are most likely true

Fairness is a **voter** because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Drop the debater **A.** to set a precedent for the best norms of debate, **B.** to deter future abuse, **C.** to rectify time lost running theory. Use **competing interps** because what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and **b)** reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. **And**, don’t vote on the RVI **since** both debaters have the burden of being fair, and specifically not on 1AR theory –

**A. Time skew -** The 2NR can spread out the 2AR no matter what and the 2A can’t fall back on 1AR work because it’s too short for that. Thus, the neg winning theory doesn’t prove they’re right: the only thing that checks back abuse is that some 2NR time will have to be devoted to theory. Outweighs since it speaks to the actual considerations involved in a theory debate, not what a world where the right argument won would look like in the abstract. Uniquely true at TOC – people have had 5 months to frontline everything so it disincentivizes theory for no gain to use the RVI at TOC specifically

**B.**  Encourages 2NRs to bait necessarily blippy 1AR shells and collapse on them for 6 minutes, including a ton of RVI work, so 1As never read theory and the better norm doesn’t win. Leads to more bad practices.

## UBI Bad – Frontlines in the Living Wage Theory File

A. Interpretation: The negative may only defend either the status quo or a competitive employment policy. To clarify, the negative may not defend a different type of economic policy such as a tax policy or transfer payment.

B. Violation: UBI is a transfer payment, not an employment policy.

C. Standards:

1. ground a) They give the neg quantitatively more ground. They get various transfer payments, changes in the tax code, as well as different wage policies while I only get living wage. Maybe this is fine in policy debate where there are many possible plans but certainly not in LD where every aff is a variation on one policy.

b) This gives the neg infinitely many advantage counterplans that solve poverty, meaning the negative will always be ahead since at best I can weigh a small solvency deficit against disads that I can’t solve with my advocacy since doing so would be intrinsic, uniquely advantaging the neg.

Ground is key to fairness since it's the basis on which we make arguments.

*2. Skews research burdens since I can’t prepare against every single argument in the literature that’s consistent with my AC, whereas he knows what I have to defend. Uniquely bad a) most of the authors in the literature defend policy options that directly contrast with the living wage, b) there’s no reason why research on the aff would interact with a non-mutually exclusive counterplan that happens to also solve for poverty outside of pure chance because authors rarely compare advantages or disads of the two simultaneously. Key to fairness because it ensures both debaters did the same work to win the round and key to education by ensuring equal research on all relevant issues.*

3. Strategy. Since in LD the aff is forced to pick a framework the neg can pick which ever cp is best under my framework. I’m always screwed because a living wage is somewhere in the middle, so under a framework where further left policies are good I’ll lose to UBI and under a framework where further right policies are good I’ll lose to a free market cp. Outweighs other abuse because I’ll lose literally every round if the neg can always have an advocacy that’s better under my framework.

4. Real world policy making. A real policy maker would simply vote yes/no on living wage, not whether the living wage is better than an unrelated policy **McKinney ‘91** explains why simulating a policy maker means fiating your cp makes no sense**[[8]](#footnote-8)**

Perhaps the most sophisticated objection to intrinsicness that 1 have heard was passed along to me by Roger Solt The crux of this argument is that the proper analogy for debate is not that of Congress voting yes or no to the affirmative plan, but that of one congressman deciding whether to endorse the affirmative plan. If the debate is, as Roger postulates, the decision of a lone Congressman, then the intrinsicness answer provides no comfort to the Congressman since he has no guarantee that if he votes for the affirmative plan, the necessary additional measures will also be adopted. Such an objection would invalidate affirmative intrinsicness of all types, whether topical or not.While novel, this protest fails as well. 1 see no justification for the basic premise that the debate should be seen through the eyes of a single congressman. If the congressman paradigm were accepted, it would invalidate all counterplans with one fell swoop. A competitive counterplan that is more desirable than the affirmative plan provides a reason to reject the affirmative plan because it demonstrates that adopting the affirmative is unwise since to do so would preclude [of] the adoption of a superior alternative (the counterplan). If the debate were seen as the decision of a single policymaker with less than absolute authority, a judge would never vote negative on a counterplan unless he thought the counterplan was likely to be adopted by the present system lest he forgo the desirable affirmative plan in lieu of the counterplan which might never be adopted. A counterplan without fiat, as would be the case under the congressman paradigm, would no longer be a counterplan but a mere disadvantage. Suffice it to say that any paradigm which destroys the counterplan should be rejected outright for reasons which are solid but do not belong in this article.

Policy making education is key **Keller**:[[9]](#footnote-9)

**Policy practice encompasses** social workers' "**efforts to** influence the development, enactment, implementation, or **assess**ment of **social policies**" (Jansson, 1994, p. 8). **Effective policy practice involves** analytic activities, such asdefining issues, gathering data, conducting research,identifying and **prioritizing** policy **options, and creating policy proposals** (Jansson, 1994). It also involves persuasive activities intended to influence opinions and outcomes, such as discussing and debating issues, organizing coalitions and task forces, and providing testimony. According to Jansson (1984, pp. 57-58), social workers rely upon five fundamental skills when pursuing policy practice activities:     \* value-clarification skills for identifying and assessing the underlying values inherent in policy positions;     \* conceptual skills for identifying and evaluating the relative merits of different policy options;     \* interactional skills for interpreting the values and positions of others and conveying one's own point of view in a convincing manner;     \* political skills for developing coalitions and developing effective strategies; and     **\* position-taking skills for** recommending, **advocating,** and defending **a particular policy.** These policy practice skills **reflect the hallmarks of critical thinking** (see Brookfield, 1987; Gambrill, 1997). **The central activities of critical thinking are identifying and challenging underlying assumptions, exploring alternative[s]** ways of thinking and acting, **and arriving at commitments after a period of** questioning, **analysis,** and reflection (Brookfield, 1987). Significant parallels exist with the policy-making process--identifying the values underlying policy choices, recognizing and evaluating multiple alternatives, and taking a position and advocating for its adoption. **Developing policy practice skills** seems to **share[s] much in common with developing** capacities for **critical thinking.**
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